

REMARKS

Claims 1-4 are amended. New Claim 33 is directed to the subject matter of prior claim 32, which is canceled.

The revised subject matter of amended claim 1 and the subject matter of claim 33 are supported by paragraphs [0012] and [0015] on pages 5 and 6 of the Specification. The revised subject matter of claim 2 is supported by paragraphs [0012] and [0020]-[0025] on pages 7 and 8 of the Specification.

Interview

The courtesy of Examiner Karikari in granting a telephone interview to attorney Edward W. Callan on December 10, 2010 is sincerely appreciated. During the interview, currently amended independent claim 1, new claim 33 and the arguments presented herein regarding the claim rejections under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, and 35 U.S.C. 102(b) were discussed. The Examiner agreed that currently amended claim 1 would overcome the claim rejection under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, and recommended that an amendment including the claims and arguments be filed.

Drawings

The drawings are corrected in the four Replacement Sheets of drawing, which are filed herewith as substitutes for the originally filed four sheets of drawings, as required Mr. Karikari.

Claim Rejections – 35 U.S.C. § 112, First Paragraph

The rejection of claims 1-29 and 32 under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, is respectfully traversed for the following reasons:

The limitation of “filtering out” is enabled by the disclosure of message filters, A-interfaces and MAP interfaces in the Specification and Drawing. Please see paragraphs [0013] and [0015]-[0018] of the Specification, and the definitions of A-interface and MAP in Newton’s Telecom Dictionary, 25th Anniversary Edition, 2009, Flatiron Publishing, New York, NY. It is submitted that a person of ordinary skill in the art would have known how to use a multiplexer (paragraph [0015]) together with an A-interface or a MAP interface (paragraph [0017]) to filter information elements out of standardized signaling protocols within a mobile communication network

Regarding the limitation of the signaling flow(s) not being relayed transparently from the interface at which information elements are filtered out of, and inserted into, the signaling flows, it is submitted that a person of ordinary skill in the art would have known that this limitation was enabled by the disclosure of the Specification for at least the following reasons:

A transparent data transmission is a data transmission without any changes to, or a lossy reduction of, the data content of the original transmission. When an information element is filtered out of, or inserted into, the content of a data transmission at an interface, the data transmission that is relayed at the interface is not transparent because the original data transmission is changed by filtering an information element out of the original data transmission or by adding the inserted information element to the original data transmission.

Therefore, the limitation of the signaling flow(s) not being relayed transparently from the interface at which information elements are filtered out of, and inserted into, the signaling flows is enabled by the disclosure of the information elements being filtered out of, and inserted into, the signaling flows at paragraphs [0012], [0015] and [0017], which teach using a message filter at A-interfaces and MAP interfaces to filter information elements out the signaling flow and insert information elements into the signaling flow.

Claim Rejections – 35 U.S.C. § 112, Second Paragraph

The rejection of claims 1-29 under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, is met by the current amendment of claim 1, from which claims 2-29 depend, in that “the” is not recited immediately before the first recitation of such terms as “signaling flows” and “standardized signaling protocols,” and the recitation of “respective” has been deleted. The recitation of “signaling flows” in place of the terms “information flows” and “signaling” is supported by the disclosure of paragraph [0015] of the Specification.

Claim Objections

Claims 3 and 4 are corrected as recommended by the Examiner.

Claim Rejections – 35 U.S.C. § 102

The rejection of claims 1-29 and 32 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being anticipated by Billstrom is respectfully traversed for at least the following reasons:

Billstrom neither teaches nor suggests at least the following limitations of independent claims 1 and 33:

- using a message filter at an interface in a mobile communication network to filter information elements out of signaling flows within the mobile communication network; and
- the signaling flows are not relayed transparently at the interface.

In Billstrom’s system, communication network 14 is interfaced with external data network 108 via GGSN 104, 116 in the communication network (FIG. 1). GGSN 104, 116 is not a message filter that filters information elements from signaling flows, as required by independent claims 1 and 33, but is instead a data and protocol format converter. A GGSN converts an incoming data stream of a first communication network using a first transmission protocol into an outgoing data stream of a second communication network using second transmission protocol.

The signaling flow relayed through a GGSN is transparent, because the original data content is not changed, and there is not a lossy compression of the relayed data. Therefore, the signaling flow relayed through GGSN 104 in Billstrom's system is not transparent.

Dependent claims 2-29 are not anticipated by Billstrom for at least the same reasons as set forth above with regard to the limitations of claim 1, from which claims 2-29 depend.

Conclusion

Reconsideration and allowance of the claims are respectfully requested. Should any issues remain unresolved, Examiner Karikari is invited to telephone the undersigned attorney.

Respectfully submitted,

Peter BRUNE et al.

By: 
Lawrence A. Maxham
Attorney for Applicant
Registration No. 24,483

The Maxham Firm
A Professional Corporation
9330 Scranton Road, Suite 350
San Diego, California 92121
Telephone: (858) 587-7659
Facsimile: (858) 587-7658